

State of California Governor's Office of Planning And Research



Proposed Appendix N:Infill Environmental Checklist form

NOTE: This sample form is intended to assist lead agencies in assessing infill projects according to the procedures provided in Section 21094.5 of the Public Resources Code. Lead agencies may customize this form as appropriate, provided that the content satisfies the requirements in Section 15183.3 of the CEQA Guidelines.

1.	Project title:
2.	Lead agency name and address:
3.	Contact person and phone number:
4.	Project location:
5.	Project sponsor's name and address:
6.	General plan designation: 7. Zoning:
8.	Prior Environmental Document(s) Analyzing the Effects of the Infill Project (including State Clearinghouse Number if assigned):
9.	Location of Prior Environmental Document(s) Analyzing the Effects of the Infill Project:
10.	Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or offsite features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)
11.	Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings, including any prior uses of the project site, or, if vacant, describe the urban uses that exist on at least 75% of the project's perimeter:
12.	Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)
Pro	TISFACTION OF APPENDIX M PERFORMANCE STANDARDS wide the information demonstrating that the infill project satisfies the performance standards in Appendix M below. For mixed-use projects , the dominant use will determine which performance standards apply to the entire project.
•	
1. [Does the non-residential infill project include a renewable energy feature? If so, describe below. If not, explain below why it is not feasible to do so.

 If the project site is included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code, either provide documentation of remediation of describe the recommendations provided in a preliminary endangerment assessment or comparable document that will be implemented as part of the project.
3. If the infill project includes residential units located within 500 feet, or such distance that the local agency or local air district has determined is appropriate based on local conditions, a high volume roadway or other significant source of air pollution, as defined in Appendix M, describe the measures that the project will implement to protect public health. Such measures may include policies and standards identified in the local general plan, specific plans, zoning code or community risk reduction plan, or measures recommended in a health risk assessment, to promote the protection of public health. Identify the policies or standards, or refer to the site specific analysis, below. (Attach additional sheets if necessary.)
4. For residential projects, the project satisfies which of the following?
Located within a low vehicle travel area, as defined in Appendix M. (Attach VMT map.)
Located within ½ mile of an existing major transit stop or an existing stop along a high quality transit corridor. (Attach map illustrating proximity to transit.)
Consists of 100 or fewer units that are each affordable to low income households. (Attach evidence of legal commitment to ensure the continued availability and use of the housing units for lower income households, as defined in Section 50079.5 of the Health and Safety Code, for a period of at leas 30 years, at monthly housing costs, as determined pursuant to Section 50053 of the Health and Safety Code.)
5. For commercial projects with a single building floor-plate below 50,000 square feet, the project satisfies which of the following?
Located within a low vehicle travel area, as defined in Appendix M. (Attach VMT map.)
The project is within one-half mile of 1800 dwelling units. (Attach map illustrating proximity to households.)
6. For office building projects, the project satisfies which of the following?
Located within a low vehicle travel area, as defined in Appendix M. (Attach VMT map.)
Located within ¼ mile of an existing major transit stop. (Attach map illustrating proximity to transit.)
7. For school projects, the project does all of the following:
The project complies with the requirements in Sections 17213, 17213.1 and 17213.2 of the California Education Code.
The project is an elementary school and is within one mile of 50% of the student population, or is a middle school or high school and is within two miles of 50% of the student population. Alternatively, the school is within ½ mile of an existing major transit stop or an existing stop along a high quality transit corridor. (Attach map and methodology.)
The project provides parking and storage for bicycles and scooters.

8. For **small walkable community projects**, the project must be a residential project that has a density of at least eight units to the acre or a commercial project with a floor area ratio of at least 0.5, or both.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The infill project could potentially result in one or more of the following environmental effects.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture and Forestry Resources		Air Quality		
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology /Soils		
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		
	Land Use / Planning		Mineral Resources		Noise		
	Population / Housing		Public Services		Recreation		
	Transportation/Traffic		Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance		
DETE	RMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead	Agend	y)				
On the	e basis of this initial evaluation:						
prior I	EIR or that are more significant than prev	ously		elopm	nat either have not already been analyzed in a nent policies would not substantially mitigate. termination (Section 15094) will be filed.		
I find that the proposed infill project will have effects that either have not been analyzed in a prior EIR, or are more significant than described in the prior EIR, and that no uniformly applicable development policies would substantially mitigate such effects. With respect to those effects that are subject to CEQA, I find that such effects WOULD NOT be significant and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION, or if the project is a Transit Priority Project a SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, will be prepared.							
prior E signific A MI	EIR, and that no uniformly applicable development, there will not be a significant effect in the	opmer is cas	nt policies would substantially mitigate such on the because revisions in the infill project have be	effect een r	R, or are more significant than described in the s. I find that although those effects could be nade by or agreed to by the project proponent. INABLE COMMUNITIES ENVIRONMENTAL		
I find that the proposed infill project would have effects that either have not been analyzed in a prior EIR, or are more significant than described in the prior EIR, and that no uniformly applicable development policies would substantially mitigate such effects. I find that those effects WOULD be significant, and an infill ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required to analyze those effects that are subject to CEQA.							
					<u> </u>		
Signat	ture		Date		_		
EVAL	UATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPAC	TS O	F INFILL PROJECTS:				

- A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) For the purposes of this checklist, "prior EIR" means the environmental impact report certified for a planning level decision, as supplemented by any subsequent or supplemental environmental impact reports, negative declarations, or addenda to those documents. "Planning level decision" means the enactment or amendment of a general plan, community plan, specific plan, or zoning code. (Section 15183.3(e).)
- 4) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur as a result of an infill project, then the checklist answers must indicate whether that impact has already been analyzed in a prior EIR. If the effect of the infill project is not more significant than what has already been analyzed, that effect of the infill project is not subject to CEQA. The brief explanation accompanying this determination should include page and section references to the portions of the prior EIR containing the analysis of that effect. The brief explanation shall also indicate whether the prior EIR included any mitigation measures to substantially lessen that effect and whether those measures have been incorporated into the infill project.
- 5) If the infill project would cause a significant adverse effect that either is specific to the project or project site and was not analyzed in a prior EIR, or is more significant than what was analyzed in a prior EIR, the lead agency must determine whether uniformly applicable development policies or standards that have been adopted by the lead agency, or city or county, would substantially mitigate that effect. If so, the checklist shall explain how the infill project's implementation of the uniformly applicable development policies will substantially mitigate that effect. That effect of the infill

- project is not subject to CEQA if the lead agency makes a finding, based upon substantial evidence, that the development policies or standards will substantially mitigate that effect.
- 6) If all effects of an infill project were either analyzed in a prior EIR or are substantially mitigated by uniformly applicable development policies or standards, CEQA does not apply to the project, and the lead agency shall file a Notice of Determination.
- 7) Effects of an infill project that either have not been analyzed in a prior EIR, or that uniformly applicable development policies or standards do not substantially mitigate, are subject to CEQA. With respect to those effects of the infill project that are subject to CEQA, the checklist shall indicate whether those effects are significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. If there are one or more "Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an infill EIR is required. The infill EIR should be limited to analysis of those effects determined to be significant. (Sections 15128, 15183.3(d).)
- 8) "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures will reduce an effect of an infill project that is subject to CEQA from "Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how those measures reduce the effect to a less than significant level. If the effects of an infill project that are subject to CEQA are less than significant with mitigation incorporated, the lead agency may prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration. If all of the effects of the infill project that are subject to CEQA are less than significant, the lead agency may prepare a Negative Declaration.
- 9) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to an infill project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 10) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

SAMPLE QUESTIONS

Issues:

		Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
<u>I</u>	. AESTHETICS. Would the project:					
	a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?					
i	b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?					
(c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?					
Ç	d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?					
E t t t t t t t t t t t t t t t t t t t	II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the					

Less Than
Significant or Less
than Significant with
Mitigation
Significant Impact
Incorporated

No Impact F

Analyzed in the Prior EIR Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies

state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?					
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?					
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?					
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?					
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?					
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?					
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?					
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?					
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?					
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?					
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or					

	Classificant Laurent	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation	No love est	Analyzed in the	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development
special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Significant Impact	Incorporated	No Impact	Prior EIR	Policies
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?					
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?					
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?					
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?					
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?					

	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	, ,,,,		
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?					
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?					
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?					
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?					
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:					
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.					
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?					
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?					
iv) Landslides?					
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?					
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in onor off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?					

	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?					
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?					
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?					
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?					
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?					
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?					
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?					
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?					

	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?					
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?					
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?					
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?					
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?					
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?					
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?					

		Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation		Analyzed in the	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development
	Significant Impact	Incorporated	No Impact	Prior EIR	Policies
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?					
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?					
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?					
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?					
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?					
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?					
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?					
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?					
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?					

	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
 c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? 					
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?					
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?					
XII. NOISE Would the project result in:					
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?					
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?					
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?					
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?					
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?					
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?					

		Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation		Analyzed in the	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development
	Significant Impact	Incorporated	No Impact	Prior EIR	Policies
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:					
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?					
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?					
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?					
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.					
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
Fire protection?					
Police protection?					
Schools?					
Parks?					
Other public facilities?					
XV. RECREATION.					
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?					

	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?					
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:					
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?					
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?					
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?					
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?					
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?					
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?					

	Significant Impact	Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	No Impact	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?					
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?					
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?					
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?					
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?					
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?					
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?					
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.					
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant of animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?					
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?					
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on					

Less Than Significant or Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Significant Impact

No Impact

Analyzed in the Prior EIR

Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies

human beings, either directly or indirectly?